



177.1

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q63507

Masayuki SATAKE, et al.

Appln. No.: 09/816,342

Group Art Unit: 1771

Confirmation No.: 6352

Examiner: Victor S. Chang

Filed: March 26, 2001

For: OPTICAL FILM LAMINATE

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the outstanding Office Action dated September 6, 2002, review and reconsideration on the merits are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's apparent reconsideration of the prior oral restriction requirement. Claims 1-6 are pending and have been examined on the merits.

In paragraph 2 at pages 2-3, claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Laurent either taken individually, or in view of JP 2000-258628 A (Abstract and Derwent Abstract, "JP '628"). The Examiner's position appears to be that Laurent relates to a pressure-sensitive adhesive composition which has reduced edge ooze on laminates. The Examiner further argues that Laurent teaches that it is known that laminate adhesive bleed or ooze can be overcome by rubbing the edges with a cloth bag filled with

RECEIVED
DEC - 9 2002
TC 1700 MAIL ROOM

Handwritten signature/initials